Construction of Low Level Causeway on Jinigehalla near Nagasamudra.

*Q.—592. Sri S. H. BASANNA (Molakalmuru).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether they have received any representation for the construction of Low Level Causeway on Jinigehalla near Nagasamudra :

(b) if so, the action taken by them in this behalf ;

(c) when the said causeway would be constructed ?

A.—Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Minister for Public Works).—

(a) Yes.

(b) Surveys are being conducted.

(c) The work will be taken up after the estimate is prepared and sanctioned.

Construction of a pick-up Channel near Naragalu Village, Basaral Hobli in Mandya Taluk.

*Q.—679. Sri J. DEVAIAH (Mandya).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) when sanction was accorded for the construction of a pick-up channel near Naragalu Village, Basaral Hobli in Mandya Taluk ;

(b) the contractor to whom the work has been entrusted ;

(c) whether the work has been completed ?

A.—Sri ALUR HANUMANTHAPPA (Deputy Minister for Minor Irrigation).—

(a) No such work was sanctioned.

(b) and (c) Do not arise in view of reply to clause (a).

TWENTY-SEVENTH REPORT OF THE BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Presentation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I present the Twenty-seventh Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

Sri A. R. PANCHAGAVI.—I beg to move :

"That this House agrees with the Twenty-seventh Report of the Business Advisory Committee."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That this House agrees with the Twenty-seventh Report of the Business Advisory Committee."

The motion was adopted.

Member's Representation

Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Hebbur).—On a point of order, Sir...

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪ ಸಲಹಾ ಸಮಿತಿಯ 27ನೇ ವರದಿಗೆ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅದರ ಪ್ರತಿ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ತಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಸಿರಾ).—ನಾನೂ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಸ್ವಾಮೀಜಿ ಅವರಿಂದ ಪಡೆದಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 13ವರೆ ಘಂಟೆಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಕೊನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷ 4 ದಿನಗಳಾದರೂ ಇದು ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಬೇಕು, ಬಹಳ ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವವರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇದು ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ 698ನೇ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ತಾವೇ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಜೆ. ಸಿ. ಭಾಗೀರಥಮ್ಮನವರು ಕೇಳಿದಂತಹ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕಲಾಪಗಳು ನಡೆಯುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಇನ್ನೊಮ್ಮೆ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. These two questions are identical. I draw your kind attention to rule No. 36 (n). It says :—

"it shall not repeat in substance questions already answered or to which an answer has been refused ;"

Mr. SPEAKER.—What was he doing all the while ? A Point of order should be raised at the earliest. If the member sleeps over it and he loses his right. (*Laughter*).

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Because the proceedings were going on, I did not interrupt.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—27ನೇ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪ ಸಲಹಾ ಸಮಿತಿ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದೆ. ನನಗೆ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಾರ ಕೂತುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು 10ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನವರೆಗೆ ಪ್ರೋಗ್ರಾಂ ಇದ್ದಹಾಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಮೊದಲು 4ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನವರೆಗೆ ಎಂದು ಇತ್ತು. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಶರಾವತಿ ಶ್ವೇತಪತ್ರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕೊಂಡಜ್ಜಿ ಬಸಪ್ಪನವರ ವರದಿ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಮೊದಲಿನಿಂದಲೂ ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದೆವು. ಹಿಂದೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಸಹ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನನಗೇಕೋ ಭಯ ಮತ್ತು ಅನುಮಾನ ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಎರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೈ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಖಂಡಿತ ಆಗಬಾರದು. ಮೂರು ದಿವಸಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಶರಾವತಿ ಶ್ವೇತಪತ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಕೊಂಡಜ್ಜಿ ಬಸಪ್ಪನವರ ವರದಿ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾದನಂತರ ಸಮಯವಿದ್ದರೆ ಏಕ್ಕ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪ ಸಲಹಾ ಸಮಿತಿ ಮತ್ತೆ ಸೇರಿ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Business of the House

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Gopala Gowda has raised a point, on which, perhaps, the House would like to be enlightened. To-day would have been a non-official day. It will be carried over to some other day, and we are taking up legislative business for the reason that this is an important matter demanding top priority. It is also expected that certain financial assistance is to be got. Members know the scarcity of water in Bangalore and also the public demand for adequate supply of water. Therefore, having considered it the Business Advisory Committee has given top priority to that. Similarly, the Mysore Co-operative Societies (Amendment) Bill, which will mean some financial assistance to the Government and clearing of bottlenecks with regard to the functioning of the Co-operative Societies, is also important. It was looked into by the Business Advisory Committee and having regard to the importance of it, it is going to be taken up on Monday. The Bangalore Corporation (Amendment) Bill which deals with the elections, I suppose, is also important and cannot be delayed; it is overdue as some people put it. Therefore, it is going to be taken up on Tuesday. We have been agitating for finances from the Centre. When money is received, it has to be spent and it has to be sanctioned by the House. So, the Supplementary Demands are going to be submitted and dealt with on Wednesday.

The Panchayat Raj Bill and Sri Kondajji Basappa Report, I believe, both are identical, and therefore the Committee thought that three days should be allotted for that, which means 13½ hours. We have put it in the shape of hours. The Members are aware that more time is taken by making statements, asking for clarifications and all that. If I reckon that also, then much of the time is lost. I am safeguarding the interests of the Members, particularly those of the Opposition, by putting it in the shape of hours. So, I am trying all that is possible to see that the Members get the maximum time. Therefore, the Members must co-operate with me. Till the 11th, that is the programme. That necessarily means that the discussion on Sharavathi White Paper will not be possible to be accommodated within this period. That does not mean that the discussion on Sharavathi is going to be dropped. It is going to be taken up keeping in view the urgency of the matter as well as the financial assistance to the State, these are very important Bills, and therefore, the Business Advisory Committee has given top priority to that, and I am bound to follow it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದೆ. ಈ ಮನೂದೆ ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು. ನಾನು ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಪಾಸು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರದಿಂದ ಬರಬೇಕಾದ ಹಣಕಾಸು ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಶರಾವತಿಯ ಶ್ವೇತ ಪತ್ರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲೇ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಆಗಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಅಗತ್ಯ. ಇದು ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೂ ನಹ ನಾವು ಬಾಯಿ ಮುಚ್ಚಿ ಕುಳಿತು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೆವು. ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ಶರಾವತಿಯ ಶ್ವೇತ ಪತ್ರ ಒಂದರ ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮನೂದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪಾಸು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ನಮ್ಮ ಆಕಾಂಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ಬದಿಗೆ

ಮತ್ತು ಆ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದವರ ಕೈಯ್ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಆ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆನ್ನುವ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಮಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ರಚಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಏಳಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನೇಮಿಸಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ಇದರ ಮೂಲಕ ನುರಿತವರನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಅನುಭವ ಉಳ್ಳವರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಕನ್‌ಸಲ್‌ಟೇಟಿವ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಒಂದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್, ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಹಾಗೂ ನೀರನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡುವ ಜನಗಳ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳನ್ನು ಒಳಪಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಂಡಿರುವಂತೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯ ದೋಷಗಳಿಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಚೇರ್‌ಮನ್ ಅವರೇ ಎಕ್ಸ್ ಅಫಿಷಿಯೋ ಚೇರ್‌ಮನ್ ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮೂರು ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸಲ ಸೇರಿ ಏನೇನು ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವ ಅವಕಾಶವೂ ಇದೆ.

ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್‌ನವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಬಹಳ ಬಡತನದಲ್ಲಿ ದುಡ್ಡು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ನೀರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ ದವರಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಫೌಂಟನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ಉಚಿತವಾಗಿ ನೀರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವ ದೂರುಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಈಗ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿ ದೀಪಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯಂತೆ ವಾಟರ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರೂ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಫೌಂಟನ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗುವ ನೀರಿಗೆ ಬಿಲ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್‌ನವರು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನೆಂದರೆ ನೋ ಪ್ರಾಫಿಟ್ ನೋ ಲಾಸ್ ಬೇಸಿಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಫೌಂಟನ್ ಅಥವಾ ಇತರ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸುವ ನೀರಿಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್‌ನವರು ದುಡ್ಡು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise for Tea and will re-assemble after half-an-hour.

The House adjourned for recess at Ten of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty-five Minutes past Ten of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ದೇವಯ್ಯ.—ಸ್ಯಾಮ್ಸಿ, ಕನ್‌ಸಲ್ಟೇಟಿವ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಆರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅನುಮಾನವಿದೆ. ಸರಕಾರದವರೇ ನಾಮಿನೇಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅಥವಾ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಸಿಟಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಬಂದ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಎಂಬುದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನೀರಿನ ಬಳಕೆದಾರರು ಎಂದರೆ ಯಾರೆಂಬುದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೇಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ನೀರು ಸರಬರಾಜಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕನ್‌ಸಲ್ಟೇಟಿವ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ, ಇದರಿಂದ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸೋಣ. ಈಗಿರುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನಿನ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಹೇಗಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ, ಅನೇಕ ಕಡೆ ನೀರಿನ ಪೈಪುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಒಂದು ಪ್ಲಾನ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಮೇಯ್ನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನೋಡಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಆನ್‌ಡೆವಲಪ್ಡ್ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿವೆ; ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಕಡೆ ಪೈಪುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಮುತುವರ್ಜಿವಹಿಸಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಪೈಪುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ನೀರು ಸರಬರಾಯಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ಧಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ)

ಇಲ್ಲಿ Consultative Committee ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರ, ಅದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ constitute ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ; ಅದು ಒಂದು ಸಬ್-ಕಮಿಟಿ ಇದ್ದ ಹಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಆಗಿ, ಅದು ರಚನೆಯಾಗದ ಹಾಗೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅದರ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ನಾಮಿನೇಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್, ಸಿಟಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮತ್ತಿತರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು elected body ಯಾಗಿ ಇಟ್ಟರೆ ಯಾವ ತರಹ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲವೂ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

General duties of the Board ಅನ್ನುವ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ, ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ಫಂಕ್ಷನ್ನುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಫ್ರೇಮ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಆಕ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಫೈನ್ ಮಾಡಿದಂತೆ ಇಲ್ಲೂ ಡಿಫೈನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ.

Board's Finance, Accounts, and Audit ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ, in February of each year, the Board shall submit to the Government statement of receipts and expenditure ಅಂತ ಸಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ ಅಂತ ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ಅಂತ ಆಳವಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ financial year, ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ಇರುವಾಗ ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರೆಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Minister for Municipal Administration).—Financial year would be same. They would be called upon to give financial statement one month earlier.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ಧಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ.—The said statement shall include a statement of the salaries of members, officers, etc., ಅಂತ ಇದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವೀಸ್ ಕಮೀಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತುಪಡಿಸಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿ. ಹಾಗಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ, the honoraria of members and salaries of officers and servants ಅಂತ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸರಿಹೋಗಬಹುದು.

ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಏನಾದರೂ ತಪ್ಪುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿರುವ ದಂಡಗಳು ಭಾರಿ ಪ್ರಮಾಣದಲ್ಲಿವೆ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತ ಇವೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಇಳಿಸಬೇಕು. ರಾ-ಬ್ರೇಕರ್ಸಿಗೆ 1,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ತನಕ ಫೈನ್ ಹಾಕುವ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗ ತಕ್ಕದು ಯೋಗ್ಯ ಅನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

ಆಡಿಟರುಗಳದು ಸಪರೇಟ್ ಎಂಗ್ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನನ್ನ Suggestion ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ: ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಆಡಿಟರ್ ನೇಮಿಸಿ, ಅವನು ಒಂದು ತಿಂಗಳು ಆದನಂತರ ಆಡಿಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಆಶಯ ಹೇಳಿ, ನನ್ನ ಈ ಎರಡು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

† Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum I).—This is one of the most important Bills that have been brought before this Hon'ble House by the Government. The main intention appears to be that the water supply scheme is to be administered by an independent and autonomous body. That appears to be the main reason why this Bill has been brought before us. We have to see Sir, whether this work of water supply and drainage is to be attended through a body which can be called independent and autonomons. The constitution of this particular body is given in Sections 3 and 4 and the following few sections. Here, the Constitution appears to be a body to be constituted by the Government with practically no restrictions on their powers of appointing them. It is going to be a body under the Government and it cannot be said to be an independent body as stated in the objects and reasons. Nor can it be an autonomous body because that body can be removed by the Government on various grounds. It cannot be said by any stretch of imagination that this body will be autonomous body or with any powers. It

will be a body completely subordinate even more subordinate than their own servants. The Government servants have got some guarantee for their services. They cannot be dismissed without due procedure being followed. There are appeals, etc. So far as this body is concerned, the Government can dismiss any member or even the whole body if they do not obey the orders of the Government. So, in both the senses, this body is not going to be either independent or autonomous. It will be merely subservient body to the wishes of the Government and they can dictate and get things done through them. So, I submit that this is an attempt on the part of the Government to deprive people, who pay for the water supply and drainage from their own pockets, of any sort of representation or powers at all. This is a body which is going to be on the same lines on which the Khadi Board, the Electricity Board and several other boards, which are nominated by the Government, simply to swindle public money and nothing else. That is the way in which the Government wants to centralise all powers in their hands in respect of the tax payer or even in respect of the present House. The powers enjoyed by the Corporation of this premier city are being withdrawn from that body and it is to be handled by the nominees of the Government.

11-00 A.M.

Sir, the main point made out by the Hon'ble Minister when he piloted this Bill before this House was that a big water supply scheme has to be taken up which may cost about 26 crores. In Bombay the water supply scheme already in existence is worth more than 50 crores, and the new scheme that is sponsored by the Bombay Corporation is going to cost them more than 100 crores. But Government has not come into nominate their hirelings to form an independent body as alleged in this Bill. If the Bombay Corporation can run such big schemes, why should the corporation of this premier city be unable to run on the same lines ? That is a point to be considered by this House before we give our votes to create this hireling body of the Government.

Next Sir, what I should like to bring to the notice of this House is that this body which is going to be created, *i.e.*, the Boards under clause 3, is to be nominated by the Government. It will have the nominees of the Government and not even the Mayor of the City is to have any voice so far as this Board is concerned. He is not a member at all. No representative of the City Corporation is taken up on this body. They are given a secondary state or importance under some other clause where they can constitute a consultative body. I do not understand—where is the necessity for a consultative body at all. When there is a body appointed—make it in some sense a representative body by taking the Mayor, and say the Chairman of the Sanitary Committee, the Chairman of the Standing Committee and one more chairman of other committees, and then, in addition to this, you can add some more experienced persons as stated in sub-clause 3 of clause 3. Then, that will be something. But, instead of that, Government wants to nominate

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

everybody, irrespectively of their importance and thereby create their own hirelings.

Then, Sir, this big work which is to be carried out by this body is said to be worth about 26 crores. But we have the experience that every Government estimate for all these public works goes on leaping and a time may come when this estimate will be 40 crores, to state at the minimum. That is why I feel that to repay this amount and to pay interest, in addition to the recurring cost which is given as 35 lakhs per year—I feel sure it will go to 45 lakhs—the tax payers in the city will have to pay atleast 15 to 20 rupees per head within the limits of the city for the supply of water and other things, because this scheme is going to be of no-profit and no-loss basis, even though it is said they have to make provision for the depreciation, for the payment of interest and for the repayment of debt, etc. If all these thinks are taken into consideration I feel that the taxes will have to be increased enormously and the people of this premier city will have to suffer a great deal without any advantage of, what I have already stated any sort of representation for the incurring of this expenditure. So, is it necessary to have such a kind of heavy taxation without any representation for the people ? Are we to pay exorbitantly .....?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.— There is no exhorbitant payment. It is only service charge—for services rendered.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—If the representatives of the people are there, they will check the expenditure. When it is completely within the hands of the Government, nobody has the power to check it. For an item which will cost Rs. 10, you will spend Rs. 100 and you will charge the entire amount to them. That is our experience in the several bodies you have set up. Further, even on the Budget or the estimates prepared by the Board and sent to the Government and which are placed before the House, there is no right of vote given to this House, so far as the Budget is concerned. It is open only for discussion and it is always the case that Government ignores whatever is said on this side of the House. Even though it is criticised by a few from the ruling party, they do not do anything, and there is no voting. All these things put together will go to show that for such huge expenditure and recurring expenditure that will have to be done, the people who will have to be taxed or as my friend has just now suggested the duty which they have to pay for services rendered, will be deprived of their legitimate right by making this particular law.

So, initially, I have to oppose this Bill on the basic principle that it is against the principles of democratic representation of the people who are to be taxed or served and it is against the basic principles of our Constitution. Then, Sir, I will deal with certain of the provisions of this Bill.

The first thing I would like to mention is, practically in every clause, the Body or the Board has been treated in first person and in a

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

Before we pass this Bill, let them correct at least technical mistakes. I have just referred about the word 'he' 'him', etc. These are wrong terminologies and wherever these words are used they must be changed.

Clause 57, sub-clause (*c*). My submission is, whenever they want to carry out any work on the private properties, they must acquire and then carry out the works. There are no rules or regulations and no standard according to which damages are to be compensated. So, I submit that the Bill requires a careful reading. Gramatical mistakes have to be corrected. There are also printers' devils.

The Hon'ble Minister has not explained to us how this scheme is to come into force. He has only given the distance of Cauvery from this place. He has not told us whether he is going to construct a reservoir by putting up a dam across that river and whether he is going to bring water here by pumping or by natural gravity.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—These facts have been given at several times at several places and I thought that Hon'ble Members might have known about them.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—When the Bill is placed before the House for its consideration, we expect the Hon'ble Minister to fully explain these matters. We do not know whether the river is at a higher level so that water can be brought by natural gravity. What is going to be done regarding filtration, whether it is to be done there or after bringing the water here nothing has been explained about these matters. Even though the Government is in a hurry to get this Bill passed, yet they owe us a duty to explain all these matters before they ask for our votes. The Hon'ble Minister said that about 120 million gallons will be provided for this city. At present this city is getting about 30 million gallons. So, the supply will be increased by four times. If that is so, what about drainage ? At present, there are only open drains creating tremendous nuisance in this city. Any stranger who happens to come to this city shudders at it. I do not know how they are going to cover all these drains and how they are going to dispose of this sewage. Whether they are going to use it as manure, whether they are going to cover these open draius-all this requires explanation. With these remarks I conclude my speech.

† **Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI** (Afzalpur).— Sir, we are told that a new chapter has begun in the history of water supply of our State. I think except Bihar no other State has such an Act in force in the whole of India. I do not know why the Mysore State has singled out this system of constituting an independent body for water supply scheme. May I know whether the Bangalore Corporation is unfit or has it shown unwillingness to handle such a scheme. We are told that even in Bombay schemes greater than these are being handled by the Corporation. Yesterday, the Minister told us that the World Bank and the Planning

singular tense: That is not correct. The Board or the Body consists of several persons ; whenever we deal with them according to grammar it must be referred to as 'them', 'their', etc. Here it is referred to as 'he' or 'his'. I know in recent years grammar has no importance in our educational system they have been practically ignored both in English as well as in regional language. But, that does not mean there should be such glaring mistakes in the provisions of the Act.

There are some provisions, for example, clauses 39, 40, 77 and 78. These four clauses make provision for construction on the property of others without acquiring them. I think this will be against the Consti tution. This will definitely be declared *ultra vires*. Further, there is some semblance of compensation mentioned if any damage is done or for any injurious eviction from that land. When this body or anybody is going to use my land by placing mains or drainage pipes, etc., they must acquire the particular piece of land before starting the work. They cannot enter into private property by giving only 15 days notice and then construct themselves and prohibit the owner doing anything so far as land is concerned. This will be unconstitutional and will be struck down in the High Court because it is a contravention of the provisions of the Constitution. If the Board has to do any work on the private property, they will have to acquire that land and then construct. Under the Land Acquisition Act there are clear provisions. If there is urgency the possession can be handed over to the Board by the Assistant Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner without acquiring as a temporary measure. So, I submit the Government will have to think twice before getting an *ultra vires* provision passed by this House.

Under clauses 12 and 13 the Board can appoint certain officers. There are other provisions but I doubt whether this can be done by the Board irrespective of the Public Service Commission. These are high posts or posts which may be carrying big pay. I feel that the Public Service Commission will have to be consulted before these appointments are made. I submit that some provision will have to be made, in this section that after consultation with the P. S. C. these appointments will have to be made. All these corrections must be made before we pass this Bill into law.

Clause 54—I am doubtful whether this clause can be of any importance. Here you say jointly and severally about the liabilities of owners or occupiers for offences incurred in regard to water supply. These are criminal offences, and how can criminal offences be made joint and several ? In the Criminal Procedure Code there is no joint and several liabilities as in the civil matters.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Conspiracy and abetment under criminal cases.....

Sri V. S. PATIL.—There is a term called vicarious liability. It refers only to civil liability. So far as criminal liability is concerned, if one crime is foisted on the other it is called the vicarious liability. So, this terminology is not intelligible and it may speak ill of our capacity as legislators. I feel the Government is in a hurry to get this Bill passed.

Commission gave advice to constitute an independent body for this purpose. In this connection, I should like to say that even the Bangalore Corporation is an independent body. It is a body corporate and has got all the powers. Therefore, I do not think that the Minister is doing any justice to the Bangalore Corporation. On the other hand, I think it is a reflection on the ability of the Bangalore Corporation to handle this water supply scheme. So far I have not come across any resolution of the Bangalore Municipal Corporation saying that it is simply incapable of handling this affair and therefore it should be entrusted to an independent body like the Water Supply and Sewerage Board.

Leaving aside this question, I should have liked the Bill in an extended form.

I do not know why this Bill has been limited to Bangalore City alone. There are many towns and cities in our State which are hungering for water. When a powerful body is being set up, why not extend this bill to the whole of the State ? When the Government is advancing loans, giving subvention and giving guarantee for loans in regard to these Bodies, am I not justified in asking the Government to extend this to the other cities and towns ? Why should they be deprived of this facility ? Yesterday, the Minister was saying that they have borrowed this provision from the Indian Electricity Act. That Act applies to the whole of India and also this State. So, the Government should have constituted a Board for the whole State. Sir, when loan was asked by the local bodies, the Minister said whether they are in a position to repay the loan. I ask whether the Bangalore City Corporation has the capacity to repay the loan.

11-30 A.M.

Then, Sir, it is said, for water supply purposes, the population of Bangalore could be calculated as 15 lakhs. At present it is 20 gallons *per capita* and the Minister said that 40 million gallons would be required which means 26 gallons per head. If 150 million gallons are supplied the *per capita* would be 100 gallons. I think it would be a surplus. The people will waste the water.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, no doubt yesterday, I said that when the scheme is complete to bring water from Cauvery, we would be able to get 120 million gallons of water. At the first stage we would be laying only one line and we would be able to get 60 million gallons. The population of the City is expected to go to 24 to 25 lakhs by the year 1980.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, it means, for the future population, the present population has to bear the burden. What I suggest is, why not extend this Board's activity to the whole of the State ! You are laying only one line for bringing 60 million gallons of water to Bangalore City. You will be spending 13 crores out of 26 crores. You can utilise the rest of the amount to other cities and towns.

(SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI)

Sir, the request has been made only for the particular purpose and the World Bank is giving this loan to the Government of India and they are giving this to us. Solving of one problem is not enough. Other cities are also in bad condition. If you go to Gulbarga and Dharwar and Hubli, you will see that there are no underground drainage schemes. I do not want to say anything against Bangalore being given this facility but I want that this should have been widened.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, this point was also considered and the World Bank advised us to limit it to metropolitan area.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, in the Bill itself it is mentioned that various rates can be imposed in various areas because it all depends upon the cost which the Board incurs in various areas. So, Government should widen the scope of this Board and apply it to the whole State.

So far as other provisions are concerned, I should say that when the Board is constituted, it is stated that the nomination element is much more in this Board. When the Government is going to take the responsibility, let them have their own choice in constituting the Board, but if the Corporation had been entrusted with this power, much expenditure would have been saved. When a Board is to be formed, a host of problems will arise, *viz.* building for Board office, big staff, etc., and a large expenditure has to be incurred. Even if you spend Rs. 60 crores, I think, the present population has to carry the whole burden of the rates, because they have to pay for at least 50 to 60 gallons of the consumption. When the Electricity Act was passed, they appointed a Rate Committee and the whole thing has been nationalised Therefore, so far as the rates are concerned, unless you appoint a Rating Committee, they cannot fix a reasonable rate. Nowhere in the Bill, the words 'reasonable cost' has been defined. I know you will not make any profit; at the same time, you do not want to run the concern on loss. The whole basis of the Bill is that it should be run as a semi-commercial concern, because it has been suggested that you are going to pay the tax also to the Income-tax authorities, when you make profit. As far as the Income-tax law is concerned, just as in the case of Electricity Board, it will be considered to be a Company. I do not think that the rates will be reasonable when this power is retained by the Board itself and it is sanctioned by the Government. Unless you appoint an independent Rating Committee I do not think that reasonable costs will be worked out by the Board and also by the Government. There are no experts in the Government, there are no economists as such and there are no expert Statisticians to give correct figures. Why not appoint a Rating Committee for this purpose? Nothing has been mentioned about revision of rates also. The rates can be revised in the same year or year after year. At least, you should have given a guarantee that the rates will not be revised for five years. That has not been done. If the capital expenditure goes up, then you are

of them are nominated by the Government. The Board exists at the will of the Government and at the wish of the Government and the Board can be removed by the Government. So it is purely a tool in the hands of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please conclude.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—The Board is expected to carry out all the details and orders of the Government. This is the scheme dictated by the Government. Even the constitution of the Board is not to be questioned. Even the defects, if any, in the Constitution cannot be questioned, according to the Bill. Similarly, the decisions of the Government in a number of respects are final. So, there is no remedy to go to any court or to prefer any appeal to a judicial court. Similarly, even the appointment of officers is to be approved by the Government. The consultative committee as it is constituted according to this Bill, is merely a farce. I do not understand why the Chairman and the members of the Board are in that committee. The Chairman of the Board also is a member of the consultative committee. The consultative committee, though an advisory body, should be a separate body from the Board. This body also will be controlled by the Government. In the financial memorandum it is said that the Board is expected to be self-sufficient. The additional expenditure is expected to be 35 lakhs of rupees per annum. Even though the Board is controlled by the Government, Government is not ready to bear the additional expenditure. According to clause 16 the Board should spend for itself within limits in the matter of finances. The Government directs how the money should be spent, it fixes priorities. Everything is controlled by Government and yet they do not take any responsibility. The Board is expected not to incure any loss and if there will be loss, Government will not go to its aid. That will harm the development of the working of the Board's activities. The proviso permits the utilisation of the capital for maintenance and operational charges with the sanction of Government. Even in the matter of fixing priorities, the first thing comes last. The main obligation of the Board is mentioned in the last item. My apprehension is that the development of the Board would suffer by these restrictions.

12 NOON.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ಗದಗ್ (ಗದಗ್).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಾಟರ್ ಸಪ್ಲೈ ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಯೂಯರೇಜ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ನಗರಗಳಿಗೆ ನೀರನ್ನು ಪೂರೈಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಡ್ರೇನೇಜ್ ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಯೂಯರೇಜ್ ಉತ್ತಮ ರೀತಿಗೊಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಮಾದರಿ ಬಿಲ್ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಇದು ಮಾದರಿ ಬಿಲ್ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಅಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದ ಅಪ್ಪೊಂದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಟ್ಟರು. ಆದರೆ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಎಂದು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿದೆ. ಹೇಗೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದು ಒಂದು ಮಹತ್ವದ ಯೋಜನೆ ಆಗಿದೆ, ಇಂಥ ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಎಕನಾಮಿಕರ್ ಆಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಮತ್ತು ಆದನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ಗದಗ್)

ಆದರ್ಶವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ ತೋರಿಸುವುದು ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅನುಭವಿಕರು, ತಜ್ಞರು ಮತ್ತು ಯಾರು ದಕ್ಷತೆಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬಲ್ಲರೋ ಅಂಥವರನ್ನು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ಉತ್ತಮ ರೀತಿಯ ಕಾರ್ಯ ನಡೆಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ವಹಿಸುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಭಾವಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಏನೇನು ಕಾಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟ್ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಆ ಮೆಟೀರಿಯಲ್ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಯಾವ ಅನುಭವ ಜ್ಞಾನ ಬೇಕೋ ಅಂಥವರು, ಮತ್ತು ಆಡಳಿತ ಅನುಭವ ಉಳ್ಳವರು ವ್ಯವಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ತಜ್ಞರಾದವರು ಒಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೇ ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಹೆಲ್ತ್ ಇಂಜನಿಯರ್ ಅವರ ಸಲಹೆ ಇಂಥ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಅವಶ್ಯವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಅವರನ್ನು ಸಮಾವೇಶ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಅಕೌಂಟಿಂಗ್ ಮತ್ತು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಒಬ್ಬರನ್ನು, ಹೀಗೆ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಮೂವರನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನೇಮಿಸುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ಇದು ಉಚ್ಚ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಸಹಕಾರಿ.

ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಟಿಯ ಆಡಳಿತ ಅಥವಾ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಟಿಯ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕಲಾಪ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನನಗೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅನುಭವವಿದೆ. ಆ ಅನುಭವವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಆ ಆಡಳಿತ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಇಂಥ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಸೂಕ್ತ. ಇನ್ನು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗ ಆದರ ಲಾಭ ಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದು ಬೆಳೆಯುವ ಪಟ್ಟಣ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನೀರಿನ ಅಭಾವವಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೊದಲು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂಥ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಸೂಕ್ತವಿದೆ, ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಅವಶ್ಯವಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇದೇ ನಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳಿ ಬಯಸುವುದು ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಭಾರತದ ಅನೇಕ ನಗರಗಳಿಗೆ ನೀರಿನ ಕೊರತೆ ಇದ್ದು ಅದರಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ನಗರಗಳು ಏನು ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಯಾಗಬೇಕೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ತರಹ ತೊಂದರೆ ಆನಾನುಕೂಲತೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ತೆರನಾದ ಯೋಜನೆ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಯಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನೀರು ಪೂರೈಸುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಸೂಕ್ತವಿದೆ; ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಟಿಗೆ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಟಿಯವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವ ತನಕ ಅವರು ಏನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಆ ನಗರದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ, ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಗೆ, ನೀರು ಪೂರೈಸುವುದು, ಡ್ರೈನೇಜ್ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಯೂಯರೇಜ್ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಟಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಟಿಯವರು ಕೇಳಿದರೂ ಸಹಿತ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ನೆವದ ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತ ಬಹಳ ದಿವಸಗಳು ತಳ್ಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ನಗರಗಳ ಪ್ರಗತಿ ಕುಂಠಿತವಾಗಲು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಆಗದಂತೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೋ ಆ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿ ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಗದಗ್ ನಗರಕ್ಕೆ ಅನೇಕ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ, ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಾಗಿನಿಂದ ನೀರು ಪೂರೈಕೆಯ ಬೇಡಿಕೆ ಇದೆ. ಇನ್ನೂವರೆಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಪೂರೈಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಹೇಳಿ ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕದ ಕೆಲವು ಖಂಡಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನನಗೆ ಕಂಡು ಬಂದಿರುವ ದೋಷದೋಷಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. 7ನೆಯ ಖಂಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯನನ್ನು ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆಡಹುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಾದ ವ್ಯವಹಾರವನ್ನು ರಾಜ್ಯನರಕಾರ ಅನೂರ್ಜಿತ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಎಂದರೆ ಪಾಯ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯವಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾವನೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯನನ್ನು ದುರಾಡಳಿತದ ಮೂಲಕ ತೆಗೆದರೆ, ಪೂರ್ತಿ ತೆಗೆಯುವುದು ಸರಿಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೊ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ (3) ನೆಯ ಉಪಖಂಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 65, ಇಂಡಿಯನ್ ಕಾಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟ್ ಆ್ಯಕ್ಟ್ 1872 ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಈ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಂತೆ ನವಲತ್ತು ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ, ಪರಿಹಾರ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ; ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿದರೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is enforceable under Section 65 of the Indian Contract Act.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ಗದಗ್.—ಆದಕ್ಕೇ ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. 31ನೆಯ ಖಂಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಕ್ಕೆ ನರಬರಾಜು ಮಾಡುವ ಎಲ್ಲ ನೀರಿಗೂ ನಗದಿಯಾದ ದರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ಲಾಭವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ನಷ್ಟವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ನರಬರಾಜು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮತ್ತು ಯಾವ ದರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. 33, 34, 35 ನೆಯ ಖಂಡಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಡೊಮೆಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ಮತ್ತು ನಾನ್ ಡೊಮೆಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ನೀರು ನರಬರಾಜಿನ ವಿಷಯವಿದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಗಾರ್ಡನ್ ಎಂದರೆ ತೋಟಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವ ನೀರು ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲರುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೋಟವಿದ್ದರೆ ಕೂಡ ಅದು ಡೊಮೆಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ಪರ್‌ಪನಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆಯ ತೋಟವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು.

44 ನೆಯ ಖಂಡದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡುವಂತಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಪೈಪು ಹಾಕಿ ನೀರನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ಕಡೆಯೂ ರೂಢಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಸಪ್ಲೈ ಪೈಪುಗಳ ಬೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾತೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ (3) ನೆಯ ಉಪಖಂಡದಲ್ಲಿರುವಂತೆ ಮೆಯ್‌ನ್ ಪೈಪಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಅದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಮೆಯ್‌ನ್ ಪೈಪನ್ನು ಯಾರು ನೀರನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅವರೇ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು. ಡೊಮೆಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ಮತ್ತು ನಾನ್ ಡೊಮೆಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ಬಳಕೆದಾರರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ್ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದು, ಏನು ರಿಯಾಯಿತಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದೂ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The main pipe is in lieu of the supply pipe. Therefore, his point is a bit fallacious.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ಗದಗ್.—ಮೆಯ್‌ನ್ ಪೈಪುಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಯಾರು ನೀರನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅವರೇ ಅದರ ಬೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please see page 32 where there is a proviso: "Provided that if under the provisions of this section, the Board lays a main in lieu of a supply pipe, the additional cost incurred in laying the main instead of a supply pipe shall be borne by him." Therefore, if he calls it a main instead of supply pipe, the cost of that will have to be recovered.

Sri K. P. GADAG.—Anyhow he will have to pay the cost of the main pipe.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no supply pipe separate from the main.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ಗದಗ್.—ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಖರ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಬರಿಯ ನೀರು ನರಬರಾಜು ಪೈಪಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ನೀರಿಗೆ ಬೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಸೂಚನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is in the case of a defaulting person. If the supply is cut for any default of the person, nobody can help it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ಗದಗ್.—ಮೆಯ್‌ನ್ ಪೈಪನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ದೂರದಿಂದ ತರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರ ಬೆಲೆಯನ್ನೂ ಬಳಕೆದಾರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು. ನಾನು ಈ ಮನೂದೆಗೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಬೆಂಬಲವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಅಣ್ಣಾರಾಯರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಇದು ಇಡೀ ಪ್ರಾಂತಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವಂತಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಏನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೂ ಉಳಿದ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನೀರು ನರಬರಾಜಿಗೂ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ, ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† Sri SANJEEVANATH AIKALA (Suratkal).—Sir, a large number of Ministers of this Ministry seem to be very anxious to justify their existence as Ministers and Deputy Ministers by bringing forward such Bills which have no serious consequences. A casual glance at the Bangalore Municipal Corporation Act shows that with its 70 main

(SRI SANJEEVANATH AIKALA)

sections and 33-sub-sections it was compreshensive enough to contain the matter included in the 129 clauses of this Bill. As said by previous speakers, the Corporation is capable enough to deal with these things. A Standing Committee of the Corporation is at present looking after these things. Even in the Bombay Corporation which spends over Rs. 1 crore for this there is no such Board like this.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Bombay was developed under different circumstances and it did not borrow from the World Bank.

Sri SANJEEVANATH AIKALA.—This is a scheme which we need not take up in the present juncture. Besides, we are going to spend Rs. 35 lakhs on establishment. This amount would have augmented the income of the Corporation and so I feel there is absolutely no justification to bring forward this measure. The Hon'ble Minister made us to believe that it will be an independent and autonomous body, but if you read in between the lines, it is absolutely not so. Everywhere the Government have the power to intervene every now and then. I have noted down here that out of 129 clauses of the Bill there are nearly 30 clauses wherein Government have delegated powers to intervene. That alone shows it will never be an independent body. It will never be an autonomous body. We have got so many independent and autonomous bodies about which I have told you day before yesterday and perhaps this Board also will be one among them. We can only visualise in what way this Board can function. There are certain provisions which will come directly in conflict with the Municipal Act in regard to distribution of power and execution of work. So, one can easily be led to believe that there is absolutely no necessity of having a Bill like this. Our elected members of the corporation are wise enough to deal with this work. About drainage I wish to say one thing. In big cities expecially in Madras and Bombay, the drainage water is pumped out and used for growing vegetables and also for certain agricultural purposes. I, therefore, suggest that this may be included here so that they can earn money out of it. The Government should see that it is made use of for such purposes.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸ್ವಾಗತಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ವಂದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ನಂಜೀವನಾಥ ಐಕಳ ಅವರು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ಸ್ವಾಗತ ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಡೀ ಸಭೆಯು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಯಾರೂ ಭಾವನೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ 150 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ಸ್ವಾಗತ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಮಾತನಾಡುವಂಥ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಉಪಯುಕ್ತ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬಂದ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಷ್ಠಾನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ತರುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇರ್ಲ್ಲಾ, ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನಿನಿಂದ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯಮಾಡಿಸಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಏಕೀಕರಣ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೊಬ್ಬರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಆಧಿಪತ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಗರ ಸಭೆಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಬಹಳ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಬಹಳ ಹೆಮ್ಮೆಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಪಟ್ಟಣ 1956 ರಲ್ಲಿ

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಆ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಆಧಿಪತ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ನೂರು ವರ್ಷ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ವಾಟರ್ ಸಪ್ಲೈ ಸ್ಕೀಂ ಮತ್ತು ಅಂಡರ್ ಗ್ರೌಂಡ್ ಡ್ರೈನೇಜ ಸಿಸ್ಟಂ ಆಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀರು ಸರಬರಾಜು ಮಾಡುವುದು, ಒಳಚರಂಡಿ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಇದರ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ನಗರ ಸಭೆಯ ಆದ್ಯ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೂ ಕೂಡ ನೂರು ವರ್ಷವಾದರೂ ಈ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರಕ್ಕೆ ಸದ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಪ್ಪಗೊಂಡನಹಳ್ಳಿ ವಾಟರ್ ಸ್ಕೋರೇಜ್‌ನಿಂದ ನೀರು ಸರಬರಾಜು ಮಾಡಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ನೀರು ಸರಬರಾಜು ಹಾಗು ಒಳಚರಂಡಿ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ನಗರ ಸಭೆಯ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ನೀರು ಸರಬರಾಜಿನ ಹೊಸ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲಾ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಒಳಚರಂಡಿ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಸೂಯೇಜ್ ಡಿಸ್ಪೋಜಲ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಉಪಯುಕ್ತವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ಐಕಳ ಅವರು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅದು ನಿಜ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-ಮೈಸೂರು ರೋಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಂಗೇರಿವರೆಗೆ ಸೂಯೇಜ್ ನೀರು ಹರಿದು ಹೋಗುವುದನ್ನು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ನೋಡಬಹುದು. ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿ ಶೀಘ್ರವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇದನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದೆ, ವರ್ಲ್ಡ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಸಹ ಈ ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿದೆ. 1963 ನೇ ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕಾ ಕ್ರಾಂತಿ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳು ಬಹಳ ಶೀಘ್ರವಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆಯುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ ಅತಿ ಶೀಘ್ರವಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಕೇವಲ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ಲಕ್ಷ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಪಟ್ಟಣವು ಇಂದು 15 ಲಕ್ಷ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯುಳ್ಳದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. 15 ಲಕ್ಷ ಜನರಿಗೆ ನಗರ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಒಂದು ಸಮಗ್ರವಾದ ಯೋಜನೆ ಕೈಗೊಂಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ ವರ್ಲ್ಡ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿನಿಂದ ನೆರವು ಸಹ ದೊರತಿದೆ. ಒಳ ಚರಂಡಿ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ ಕಾವೇರಿ ನದಿಯ ನೀರು ತರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆ ಇದೆ. ತಂದ ನೀರು ಉಪಯೋಗವಾದಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಳಚರಂಡಿ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಡಿಸ್ಪೋಜಲ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಯೋಜನೆ ಸಹ ಇದೆ. ಅದರ ಪ್ರತಿಫಲ ದೊರೆಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಸಮರ್ಪವಾಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಮನಗಂಡು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಕೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಶಾಸನವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಅಥವಾ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಶಾಸನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಸಾಲಿಸಿಟರ್ ಜನರರ್ ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಯಿತು. ರಾಜ್ಯ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ಲ್ಡ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಸಹ ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಆ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರ. ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ಕೇಳಿದರು. 55 ಮೈಲಿ ದೂರದಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎತ್ತರಕ್ಕೆ ನೀರು ಏರಿಸಿ ತರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಅನೇಕ ಕಡೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. 55 ಮೈಲಿ ದೂರದಿಂದ ನೀರನ್ನು 1500 ಅಡಿ ಎತ್ತರಕ್ಕೆ 4 ಕಡೆ ಪಂಪ್ ಮಾಡಿ ನೀರು ತರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 10-12 ಮೈಲುವರೆಗೆ ಗ್ರಾವಿಟಿ ಫ್ಲೋ ದಿಂದ ತರಬಹುದು. ನೀರು ಫಿಲ್ಟರ್ ಅಂದರೆ ಶುದ್ಧೀಕರಣವಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರಕ್ಕೆ ನಾಕಷ್ಟು ನೀರು ಪೂರೈಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಈ ನೀರನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರವನ್ನು ಸ್ವಚ್ಛವಾಗಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದಲ್ಲದೆ ಸೊಳ್ಳೆ ಕಾಟ, ದುರ್ವಾಸನೆ ಇಂಥ ಯಾವ ತೊಂದರೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Bill, 1964 be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

12-30 P.M.

CLAUSE 3.

Sri SIDDAIAH KASHIMATH.—Sir, I beg to move :

" That in sub-clause (2) (not numbered in the Bill) for the words 'not less than three and not more than seven members' the words 'not less than five and not more than nine members' shall be substituted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That in sub-clause (2) (not numbered in the Bill) for the words 'not less than three and not more than seven members' the words 'not less than five and not more than nine members' shall be substituted."

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I am not accepting the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

" That in sub-clause (2) (not numbered in the Bill) for the words 'not less than three and not more than seven members' the words 'not less than five and not more than nine members' shall be substituted."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The next amendment is in the name of Sri Sunthankar.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, I beg to move :

'That in sub-clause (2) the words "not less than three and not more than" shall be deleted.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

'That in sub-clause (2) the words "not less than three and not more than" shall be deleted.'

Is the Hon'ble Minister accepting the amendment ?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That in sub-clause (2) the words "not less than three and not more than" shall be deleted.'

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That sub-clause (6) shall be deleted."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put clause 3 to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 4.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment to clause 4.

Sri SIDDIAH KASHIMATH.—Sir, I beg to move:

'That for the words "the Board shall hold office for such period", the words "the Board shall hold office for three years" shall be substituted.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

'That for the words "the Board shall hold office for such period" the words "the Board shall hold office for three years" shall be substituted.'

I suggest that the House should sit till 1 O' clock and finish as much as it is possible.

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—Yes, Sir.

Sri SIDDIAH KASHIMATH.—Even in the other clause also, it has been particularly mentioned three years. For that purpose only this amendment has been brought and I hope the Hon'ble Minister will accept this amendment.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I am not accepting it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put it to the vote of the House, unless the member withdraws.

The question is:

'That for the words "the Board shall hold office for such period" the words "the Board shall hold office for three years" shall be substituted.'

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the clause to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 5.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are no amendments to clause 5 and I will, therefore, put it to the House.

The question is :

"That clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 6.

Sri SIDDIAH KASHIMATH.—Sir, I move :

"That item (d) of sub-clause (1) shall be deleted."

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I move :

"That in item (d) of sub-clause (1) the words 'or seeks to become' shall be deleted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Both amendments are moved.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—As a matter or fact I fully agree with the amendment moved by Sri Siddiah Kashimath I do not understand why a member of the parliament or State legislature should be debarred from being a member of this Board. There may be some reasons which the Government have thought fit. At least the sitting member may not be allowed but the words 'member seeks to become' should be deleted. Supposing a member of the Board seeks an election, why should he be debarred ? If he is elected he may be disqualified and debarred.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, I cannot agree.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That item (d) of sub-clause (1) shall deleted."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That in item (d) of sub-clause (1) the words 'or seeks to become' shall be deleted."

The amendment was negatived.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I move :

"That sub-clause (5) shall be deleted."

Mr. SPEAKER.— Amendment moved :

"That sub-clause (5) shall be deleted."

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Here, the Government can remove the Chairman and the members of the Board. In the statement of objects and reasons it is stated that this will be an independent and autonomous body. If at the will of the Government the members and Chairman could be removed where remains autonomy or independence of the board ?

The Board is expected to be independent and autonous but this sub-clause takes away that. If there is any fault or derelictions, the Government can use its power and can correct them.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I cannot accept the amendment. Nowhere it is stated that at the will of the Government they will be removed. It is stated here that if the Board fails to follow the recommendations issued by the Government under this Act, then the Government can remove the persons. If my friend wants them to stay on in power inspite of such an act, it means running of a parallel Government.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That sub-clause (5) shall be deleted."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clause 6 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 7

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I move :

"That sub-clause (4) shall be deleted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That sub-clause (4) shall be deleted."

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—According to the sub-clause the decision of the State Government shall be final. So, there will be no remedy for the aggrieved party to prefer an appeal to a judicial court. That is very unfair. In the name of fairness and justice, there should be a remedy to prefer an appeal to the judicial court. In any case the decision of the State Government should not be final.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, I am not accepting the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That sub-clause (4) shall be deleted."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clause 7 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clauses 8 to 10, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The Motion was adopted.

Clauses 8 to 10, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 11.

Sri SIDDIAH KASHIMATH.—I move :

'That in sub-clause (1) for the words "the Board shall hold ordinary meetings at such intervals as may be provided in the regulations" the words "the board shall hold ordinary meetings every month" shall be substituted.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

'That in sub-clause (1) for the words "the Board shall hold ordinary meetings at such intervals as may be provided in the regulations" the words "the board shall hold ordinary meetings every month" shall be substituted.'

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I am not accepting it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That in sub-clause (1) for the words "the Board shall hold ordinary meetings at such intervals as may be provided in the regulations" the words "the board shall hold ordinary meetings every month" shall be substituted.'

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clause 11 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clauses 12 and 13 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 12 and 13 were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 14.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I move :

'That in sub-clause (1) for the words "members of th Board.....not more than nine" the words "nine members" shall be substituted.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

'That in sub-clause (1) for the words "members of the Board.....not more than nine" the words "nine members" shall be substituted.'

† **Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.**—Here, the consultation committee according to the provisions will consist of not less than 3 members and not more than 9 members. The members of the Board shall be the members of the consultation committee. By this amendment I see that the consultation committee should be a separate and independent body of the board. As it is consultation committee have no advisory functions. The Board and Chairman should not be there in the committee. It should consist of 9 members, and not from 3 to 9. I want to fix the number of 9 members and the members of the Board should not be in the committee.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I request my Hon'ble friend Sri B. R. Sunthankar to withdraw this amendment in order to facilitate the Hon'ble Minister in charge to have his hirelings as and when they crop up, to be appointed on the Board.

Sri K. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, I am not accepting the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That in sub-clause (1) for the words "members of the Board..... not more than nine" the words "nine members" shall be substituted.'

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clause 14 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 14 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clauses 15 and 16 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 15 and 16 were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 17.

Sri SIDDIAH KASHIMATH.—I move :

'That in sub-clause (1) for the words "in February of each year" the words "in March of each year" shall be substituted.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

'That in sub-clause (1) for the words "in February of each year" the words "in March of each year" shall be substituted.'

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I am not accepting it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'That in sub-clause (1) for the words "in February of each year" the words "in March of each year" shall be substituted.'

The amendment was negatived.

Sri SIDDIAH KASHIMATH.—Sir, I move amendment:

"That in sub-clause (2) of clause 17 for the words 'statement of the salaries of members, officers and servants of the Board' the words 'statement of the honorarium of the members and the salaries of the officers and servants of the Board' be substituted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That in sub-clause (2) of clause 17 for the words 'statement of the salaries of members, officers and servants of the Board' the words 'statement of the honorarium of the members and the salaries of the officers and servants of the Board' be substituted."

† Sri SIDDIAH KASHIMATH.—It is mentioned 'salaries' here. Then the members will become the servants of the Board. In the case of members, it should be treated as honorarium. For that purpose the word honorarium' is used.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I am not accepting the amendment. Every member drawing a salary would not become an officer subordinate to the Board.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That in sub-clause (2) of clause 17 for the words 'statement of the salaries of members, officers and servants of the Board' the words 'statement of the honorarium of the members and the salaries of the officers and servants of the Board' be substituted."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clause 17 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 17 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clauses 18 to 20. The question is:

"That clauses 18 to 20, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

MR. SPEAKER.— Amendment moved:

'That in item (d) the words "swimming baths, public baths or" shall be deleted.

Item (f) shall be deleted.

In sub-clause (ii) of item (h) the words "other than swimming baths or public paths" shall be deleted.'

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—This clause deals with charges for domestic and non-domestic purposes. My idea is that swimming pools and public baths should be included in domestic purposes. Swimming tanks may not be exempted. For bathing purposes also wholesome water should be supplied. Hotels, residential houses and colleges should be provided with wholesome water for bathing.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—We would be supplying water for all purposes but the charges would be at domestic rates. Water will not be denied.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'That in item (d) the words "swimming baths, public baths or" shall be deleted.

Item (f) shall be deleted.

In sub-clause (ii) of item (h) the words "other than swimming baths or public baths" shall be deleted.'

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clause 33 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 33 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSES 34 to 37.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clauses 34 to 37, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 34 to 37, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 38

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I beg to move:

'That in sub-clause (1) the words "subject to the payment by the Corporation of such charges as the Board may determine" shall be deleted.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

'That in sub-clause (1) the words "subject to the payment by the Corporation of such charges as the Board may determine" shall be deleted.'

†Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—The object of this sub-clause is to ensure free supply of watar to the public. The Corporation is to meet the charges of this free supply, according to the provision of the bill. Then it will not be gratituous. The Corporation will levy water rate on the people and thus the people will have to pay for it. At present the Corporation is supplying water free.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The Corporation is supplying water freely to the consumers. The same is to be continued by the Board but the Board will charge the Corporation. When the Board is taking the entire water supply system, why should the Corporation come into the picture just to pay charges. The Corporation is not collecting water tax, it will be collected by the Board.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Even now the Corporation is collecting water tax. A certain percentage of the house tax is charged as water tax on the rate-payers. Because of this, they are putting up public fountains. If that facility is to be continued, they will have to come to some understanding with the Board. I can not accept the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That in sub-clause (1) the words "subject to the payment by the Corporation of such charges" shall be deleted.'

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clause 38 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 38 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSES 39 TO 52.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clauses 39 to 52, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 39 to 52, both inclusive, were added to the Bill

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 53.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I beg to move :

"That in clause 53, in item (a) of sub-clause (1) the words 'for more than three months' shall be added after the word 'unoccupied'."